RIDE Professional Practice (Teachers) Working Group
Meeting #4 – Guiding Document
August 26, 2010   Room 408, 1-4pm

Meeting Objectives
1. Review the teacher professional practice competencies and:
   a. Determine whether RIPTS are clearly represented
   b. Check for language clarity
   c. Eliminate overlap with professional responsibilities
2. Reach consensus on the competencies included in the teacher professional practice framework
3. Agree on performance level descriptors at level 4 for each competency
4. Begin drafting performance level descriptors for levels 1-3 of each competency
5. Collect thinking about usability as a tool – what format would be best for both the evaluator and the evalautee?

Guiding Questions for Discussion

Reaching Consensus on Competencies

- When reviewing the competencies, is it clear they have been built with the RIPTS in mind?
- If a teacher did all of these things well, would his or her students demonstrate significant learning growth?
  o If not, what is missing?
- Are there any competencies that are repetitive?
  o If so, how can they be combined or eliminated as necessary?
  o Are any competencies represented in the professional responsibilities framework that could be eliminated from the professional practice framework?
- Are the competencies worded adequately? Is it clear what they are describing?

Performance Level Descriptors

For each competency, use the following questions to guide your thinking:
- When looking at the sample level 4 descriptor, does it adequately capture what you would expect exceptional or excellent to look like?
  o Is it rigorous enough?
  o Is it easily observable? Could an evaluator walk into your classroom and see this happening?
- What would it look like to meet the expectations of this competency without being exceptional? (draft level 3)
- What does it look like to not meet the expectations of this competency? (draft levels 2 and 1)

The Framework as a Tool

- Think of an evaluation tool you have seen before.
  o What about the format did you like?
  o What about that format did you not like?